



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

otherwise of much service to the student of Oceanic and particularly Melanesian culture.

R. B. DIXON.

The Chimariko Indians and Language. By ROLAND B. DIXON. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology, vol. 5, no. 5, pp. 293-380. Berkeley: The University Press, 1910.

In this paper Dr Dixon gives us another study of the ethnographic region in which he is a recognized authority, that of northern California. Unlike the Maidu, Shasta, Achomawi, and Atsugewi, however, with which tribes Dr Dixon has heretofore concerned himself, the Chimariko no longer exist as a distinct tribe, but linger on in only two aged individuals; from one of these, Mrs Dyer, and from a man named Friday, who, though not a Chimariko, had formerly been in close touch with the tribe, the material presented in the paper was gathered in 1906. As indicated by its title, the paper falls into two parts, the first dealing with culture (pp. 295-306), the second with language (pp. 307-380). The topic of culture, discussed under the heads of territory and history, material culture, social organization, and religion, is necessarily very fragmentary and calls for no particular comment.

The linguistic portion is fuller than the ethnologic, but as the grammatical material obtained was fragmentary, and the few texts that are given are confused and unsatisfactory, many points of importance remain obscure. It would be wholly unfair to judge Dr Dixon's work as one might a grammatical treatise laying claim to completeness. The circumstances under which the material was secured were such that it seems rather in order to thank Dr Dixon for having rescued as much of the Chimariko language as he did. The linguistic material is discussed by him under the heads of phonetics, reduplication, composition, pronoun, noun, verb, adjectives, numerals, postpositions, connectives, and order of words.

There seem to be two series of stopped consonants, surds and sonants; judging from such not far distant linguistic stocks as Takelma, Athapascan, and Yana, in which aspirated surds and "intermediates" but no true sonant stops are found, one may be permitted to surmise that Dr Dixon's sonants are really intermediates, as he himself expressly states for *b*. It is surprising to find that no distinct series of "fortes" or checked stops is credited to Chimariko, the more so as not only the three stocks already referred to but also the immediately adjoining Wintun and Shastan (as represented by Achomawi) possess these consonants, as the reviewer

knows from personal experience. Such orthographies in the vocabulary, however, as *p'untcibum* "six" and *t'amina* "flea" strongly suggest that the fortis series is not absent in Chimariko. Moreover, Dr Dixon does not always carefully keep apart, it would seem, fortes from ordinary surds. Thus, the Achomawi form *hak* "two" (p. 338) was distinctly heard by the reviewer as *hakl*, with which its Chimariko cognate *xok'u* is in striking agreement.

Reduplication of an interesting type occurs in Chimariko, that in which the latter part of the stem is repeated, as, *tsokoko-tci* "bluejay," *himimitcei* "grouse." This type of reduplication is also frequently employed in Chinookan in animal names. Very characteristic are the pronominal affixes, one series being employed as subjects of neuter verbs, objects of transitive verbs, and possessives with nouns inherently possessed, while the other series is restricted to subjects of active verbs and to indicate accidental possession. The use of distinct pronominal elements to differentiate active from neuter verbs and natural from acquired possession is reminiscent of Siouan. It is very strange indeed that certain verb stems require the pronominal elements to be prefixed, while others take them as suffixes; inherent possessives are always prefixed, accidental possessives suffixed. Syntactical cases are lacking in the noun, while material cases, as far as Dr Dixon's material allowed him to gather, are confined to a locative-ablative and an instrumental. The verb complex includes, besides the stem and pronominal affixes of subject or object (never, it would seem, of both subject and object), a set of instrumental prefixes, local suffixes, and, always last in the complex, temporal and modal suffixes. The prefixes of body-part and other instrumentality, expressing such ideas as "with a long object," "with the end of a long object," "with the head," "with the foot," "with a round object," and "with the hand," are interesting as affording another example of a widespread American tendency. Such prefixes occur, as Dr Dixon remarks, in the Shasta, Maidu, and Wintun stocks in the neighborhood of Chimariko; outside of these also in Shoshonean, Siouan, Pomo, and, though not quite analogously, Takelma. The local suffixes, again a well developed morphological category in America, include elements expressing such ideas as "down," "up," "into," "out of," "across," "through," and "towards"; their use makes intelligible the defective development of case suffixes in nouns. Among the modal affixes the negative is peculiar in that it is in some cases prefixed, in others suffixed.

After the grammatical sketch proper Dr Dixon takes up the matter of the possible genetic relationship of Chimariko and Shastan (Shasta,

Achomawi, Atsugewi). A few general morphologic resemblances are noted; by far the most striking point of resemblance, however, in the opinion of the reviewer, is not referred to in this connection, but is mentioned earlier in the paper, namely the use of pronominal elements as both prefixes and suffixes. A table of fifty-seven lexical correspondences, embracing body-part nouns, natural and cultural objects, three numerals, verb stems, instrumental prefixes, local suffixes, and pronouns, is given as the main evidence of a Chimariko-Shastan linguistic unit. A few of the examples seem rather far-fetched, but on the whole the evidence appears convincing, the more so as so many of the correspondences are with the non-contiguous Achomawi rather than with the neighboring Shasta. With Chimariko *-pen*, *-hen* "tongue" seems to be cognate not only Shasta *ehena*, as noted by Dr Dixon, but also Achomawi *ip'li* (reviewer's manuscript material). On the whole the weight of probability is in favor of the genetic relationship proposed by Dr Dixon. In the absence as yet, however, of extended grammatical studies of the Shastan dialects, it is difficult for the student to express a definite opinion.

Six text fragments, with interlinear translations and grammatical notes, follow. Their extremely disjointed character lessens very considerably the value of these for either linguistic or mythological purposes. Vocabularies, English-Chimariko and Chimariko-English, close the paper. One criticism can be made of these vocabularies—Dr Dixon does not seem to have taken pains to combine in them the lexical material which he obtained as such with that which is scattered in his grammatical notes and texts. Thus, the text words *xatci'la* "children" and *aqā'deu* "grass seed" (p. 347, ll. 5, 10) are to be found listed in neither of the vocabularies. Conversely, grammatical material scattered in the vocabulary is not made use of to the extent that could be desired in the grammatical sketch. Thus, the word *lētretre* "spotted," evidently an excellent case of final reduplication, is not listed in the examples given under the heading "reduplication"; this form is particularly interesting in view of Dr Dixon's statement, "Color adjectives, it is interesting to note, do not appear to be reduplicated."

In other words Dr Dixon does not seem to have completely utilized all his material; the very fragmentariness of the material makes it particularly desirable that the most should have been made of it. Despite the various points of criticism offered Dr Dixon's paper must be considered a valuable contribution to our knowledge of Californian linguistics.

EDWARD SAPIR.